



FILED

06-22-06
02:37 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of NextG Networks of California, Inc. (U 6754 C) to expand its existing Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity [A.02-09-019, D.03-01-061] to include full Facilities-based Telecommunications Services.

Application 06-05-031
(Filed May 19, 2006)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING
MOTION TO SHORTEN PROTEST PERIOD**

This ruling denies NextG Networks of California, Inc.'s (NextG) motion to shorten the protest period for its application to modify its certificate of public convenience and necessity.¹ Oppositions to the motion were filed by the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) and Clearlinx Network Corporation (Clearlinx) on June 14, 2006 and June 20, 2006, respectively.

NextG's motion requested that protests be filed within 15 days of notice of its application in the Commission's Daily Calendar, because NextG must receive the authority requested for competitive purposes and to fulfill contractual obligations. The application was noticed in the Daily Calendar on June 5, 2006. On June 5, NextG served a notice of availability of its application. CCSF and Clearlinx requested copies of NextG's application and received the application and accompanying motion on June 9 and June 6, 2006, respectively. CCSF and Clearlinx oppose the motion to shorten the protest period, because they need the

¹ An e-mail ruling denying the motion was sent to the parties on June 20, 2006.

time provided under Rule 44.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice to prepare and file their protests and/or responses. CCSF states the application raises serious questions concerning the scope of the Commission's review of NextG's construction activities under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Clearlinx states NextG's arguments are without merit, because NextG should have known what authority it needed prior to this time and what its construction limitations were in negotiating contracts. Since the parties need time to prepare their protests and/or responses, they shall have until July 5, 2006 to file them.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated June 22, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JANICE GRAU
Janice Grau
Administrative Law Judge

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a copy of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the copy of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated June 22, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ELIZABETH LEWIS
Elizabeth Lewis

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 22-JUN-2006 by: SMJ
A0605031 NOPOST

***** APPEARANCES *****

Stephen P. Bowen
Attorney At Law
BOWEN LAW GROUP
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 920
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 394-7500
steve.bowen@bowenlawgroup.com

Treg Tremont
SUZANNE TOLLER, EDWARD W. O'NEILL
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834
(415) 276-6500
tregtremont@dwt.com
For: NextG Networks of California, Inc.

William K. Sanders
DENNIS J. HERRERA
Deputy City Attorney
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682
(415) 554-6771
william.sanders@sfgov.org
For: City And County of San Francisco

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Janice L. Grau
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5011
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1223
jlg@cpuc.ca.gov

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Robert L. Delsman
Attorney At Law
NEXTG NETWORKS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
2216 O TOOLE AVENUE
SAN JOSE CA 95131
rdelsman@nextgnetworks.net